

SAFETY MATCH LAW AIDS TRUST

Virginia Merchants and Independents Oppose Measure on That Ground.

BUTTON IN FAVOR OF IT
Long Hearing Before Committee, at Which Inside Facts Come Out.

Representatives of match manufacturers and wholesale grocers crowded the committee room and took issue with advocates of the measure when the Senate Committee on Insurance and Banking met yesterday afternoon to hear arguments for and against Senator Harman's match bill. The measure proposes to make unlawful in Virginia the sale of the "criminal, strike-anywhere" parlor match, legalizing only the safe or those matches which require a specially prepared surface for ignition.

The argument by opponents of the bill directed attention to the fact that no State in the Union has enacted any such law, and that to do so would be to place Virginia's wholesale and retail merchants at a serious disadvantage compared with dealers in other States, who labored under no such restrictions. In favor of the bill it was advanced that the "strike-anywhere" parlor match is the frequent cause of fire and loss of life. The committee reached no decision, but it was evident from the questions raised by its members that the bill will leave the committee room with important modifications.

Cause of Many Fires.
Commissioner of Insurance Joseph Brown and H. S. Amoson, president of the Virginia National Fire Insurance Company, of Philadelphia, opened the argument for the measure. Ten per cent of all fires, they stated, were directly attributable to unsafe parlor matches. In Chicago, said Mr. Amoson, a recent report placed the number as high as 20 per cent.

Aside from the property loss which their use entails, said the Philadelphia man, they are the cause annually of the loss of between 1,000 and 1,200 lives. Women, with their flimsy summer dresses, they said, were frequent victims. Parlor matches present an unfailing source of attraction to children, who pick them to hear them pop, and fires are started in this way which frequently result in loss of life.

Norfolk Protesters.
A. B. Goodrich appeared for the wholesale dealers of Norfolk with a vigorous protest. Only 5 per cent of the matches in use, he told the committee, are of the safety type. The people do not want them. For years both kinds have been on sale side by side, but only the parlor match has been popular.

Carelessness in disposing of the stump after the match is used, and not the parlor match per se, he thought, was responsible for the fires which are charged up against it. To enact such a law, he declared, would be to damage the annual match business of Norfolk to the extent of \$200,000, and the business of other cities in the State proportionately. He expressed himself as being in hearty accord with the movement to unify as far as possible the fire laws of the country, but thought that only the Federal Government could effect a uniform law nationwide in its application, could deal wisely with the match situation.

Opposed by Manufacturers.
F. W. Woods, of the Ohio Match Company, appeared before the committee with a complete exhibit of the different kinds of matches in use in this country and Europe, and spoke against the proposed law from the standpoint of the manufacturer. The measure, he thought, while excluding the convenient match now in use, would permit the sale of matches which are dangerous.

The real danger, he pointed out, is not in the fact that a match strikes anywhere, but in its improper disposal after it is lit and in the glowing coal which lives after the flame is out. Many matches of the type which under the proposed law would be prohibited are safe, are in reality the most dangerous because of the long life of the glowing coal, due to improper impregnation.

A serious consequence of the law, if it were adopted by all the States, would, he declared, be the destruction of all independent match manufacturing plants in the United States excepting one, the Diamond Match Company, which alone is equipped to supply the so-called safety match in competition with Europe. His company is enabled to do this because of its subsidiary plants in Sweden, where cheap labor and cheap wood are able to produce this match cheaper than they can be made in this country.

Could Harm Virginia Company.
The proposed law, he seriously affected our new plant in Roanoke, said W. B. Hutchinson, of the Salvation Match Company, of New Jersey. He took the same stand as Mr. Woods as to the probable effect it would have on the match business of the State. The committee is dangerous, until it is lit, and proper disposal of stumps would accomplish the purpose sought. A modification of the bill to prohibit the sale of improperly impregnated matches and those which are dangerous, he said, would be a far more desirable.

Chief Jones, of the Richmond Fire Department, read from 1911 records of the department numerous instances of fires arising from careless use of matches. A petition was presented from the wholesalers and jobbers of Richmond asking the General Assembly to register its vote against the bill.

Rheumatism
Try Sloan's Liniment for your rheumatism—don't rub—just lay it on lightly. It goes straight to the sore spot, quickens the blood, limbers up the muscles and joints and stops the pain.

SLOAN'S LINIMENT
is fine for lame muscles.

At all drug stores. Price 25c, 50c, and \$1.00.

Dr. Earl S. Sloan - Boston, Mass.

Famous Musicians

Use and praise the

Hardman Pianos

They find that it meets their every requirement.

Tetrazzini

"I use the Hardman exclusively." Let us send you free catalog. We are sole agents.

Walter D. Moses & Co.

103 E. Broad St.

Oldest Music House in Va. and N. C.

ONLY ONE COUNTY CHANGES POSITION

(Continued From First Page.)

bill prohibiting the sale of what is called by the "Fire Marshals' Association of the United States the "criminal match"—the ordinary affair of commerce. It was opposed by representatives of manufacturers of the common match, who said the legislation was with makers of safety matches.

The House Committee on General Laws approved the bill making October "Columbus Day" and it was reported to the House yesterday morning.

The bill extending the hours of work for State employees was also approved in committee.

HOUSE

A Committee on Officers and Orators at the Capitol reported favorably to the House in the beginning of yesterday's session. The Kemper bill, which would amend the Code so as to require the State employees to work eight hours, was reported by the committee. The Speaker appointed Mr. Brown, of Westmoreland, and Mr. Norris, of Richmond county, to the committee on the part of the House to take up the Maryland boundary question.

Mr. Throckmorton, rising to a question of personal privilege, read from an account of a meeting of the Richmond City Council on Tuesday night, which Councilman George Melby Blake was quoted as saying: "A bill to defect the building of this road (the Seven Times line) has been offered to the City Council by a man for his own personal gain, and I am sure that Mr. Throckmorton, its patron, appeared as attorney for some of the protesting parties before the Street Committee—and now in their interest he is trying to block this great plan."

"This statement made by this man, Blake," said Mr. Throckmorton, "is a deliberate effort to mislead the House. I was never connected with the Seven Times proposition as attorney, but appeared as a citizen of Henrico county, an old friend of the people. The statement by this Blake was made at a meeting of the Council called to discuss the ordinance to defect the building of this road."

Sensors Invited.
On motion of Mr. Bell, the House voted to invite Senators Martin and Swann to address the General Assembly at some time which will suit their convenience.

Mr. Milstead invited the members to attend the annual meeting and dinner of the Newport News Chamber of Commerce next Tuesday night. Forty-seven acceptance were received.

The calendar being reached, the State Tax Commission bill was passed by, with the consent of the patron.

The House agreed to the Senate joint resolution providing for a committee to make arrangements for the formal reception of a portrait of the late Senator John W. Daniel. The House Committee is composed of Mr. Jennings, Captain Baker and Mr. Ewing.

Sign Laborers' Exemption.
Mr. Wilkey favored the passage of the bill which would exempt only one in the interest of the laboring classes. The man on the farm, or in the small store, he said, should be equally considered a laboring man, and should be entitled to some protection, and to a chance to make the debts due him. As a matter of fact he continued, it is impracticable to collect from more than one in fifty of the average householders. They have the \$2,000 exemption and the poor debtors' law.

Mr. Montague, the patron of the bill, urged its passage. He explained that under the law as it stands the owner of a house or the merchant cannot make men pay their debts. He thought business men would be more likely to extend credit when necessary if they knew they can make the amount ahead of the loan, shark or the saloonkeeper.

The bill, Mr. Montague said, would exempt the merchant, he said, should be considered, as is the man who buys. He wanted to catch bill dodgers and not protect them. The merchants of the State in 1909, he said, paid \$21,000 in revenue and bought \$290,000 worth of goods.

House Approves Bill.
On a vote the Coleman amendment was lost, 25 to 23. On the proposition to engross, the Speaker announced that as yet had won, and Mr. Cox moved to reconsider. Seeking to his motion, he argued that the bill would be a benefit to the State.

As a man living in a city ought to have a month exemption, and that if he is dishonored he can beat the bill by the exemption of \$2,000. Given briefly, opposed the motion to reconsider.

On a vote the Coleman amendment was lost, 25 to 23. On the proposition to engross, the Speaker announced that as yet had won, and Mr. Cox moved to reconsider. Seeking to his motion, he argued that the bill would be a benefit to the State.

As a man living in a city ought to have a month exemption, and that if he is dishonored he can beat the bill by the exemption of \$2,000. Given briefly, opposed the motion to reconsider.

On a vote the Coleman amendment was lost, 25 to 23. On the proposition to engross, the Speaker announced that as yet had won, and Mr. Cox moved to reconsider. Seeking to his motion, he argued that the bill would be a benefit to the State.

As a man living in a city ought to have a month exemption, and that if he is dishonored he can beat the bill by the exemption of \$2,000. Given briefly, opposed the motion to reconsider.

On a vote the Coleman amendment was lost, 25 to 23. On the proposition to engross, the Speaker announced that as yet had won, and Mr. Cox moved to reconsider. Seeking to his motion, he argued that the bill would be a benefit to the State.

As a man living in a city ought to have a month exemption, and that if he is dishonored he can beat the bill by the exemption of \$2,000. Given briefly, opposed the motion to reconsider.

LEGISLATIVE COMMENT

By LEWIS H. MACHEN

STATE WIDE PROHIBITION—II.

Having traced the recent legislation of this State regarding the question of alcoholic liquor, it may be interesting to group some of the arguments for and against the passage of the State-wide prohibition referendum measure which are just now being heard in and around the halls of the Legislature.

To begin with, the fundamental cleavage between the prohibitionists and the opponents of the measure is the liquor business, who do not wish to run the risk of seeing their business and the property swept away or materially damaged on the one hand, and the thoroughgoing enemies of what they call the rum demon, on the other, who desire to see the traffic in spirituous beverages prohibited throughout the State, and the manufacture practically broken up. Naturally, there is little or no common ground upon which these two forces can be peaceably assembled.

Besides these extremes are those who advocate the use of liquor themselves, and to whom the question assumes no particularly personal form, those who use it occasionally and in moderation, and, while deploring the excesses of their weaker brethren, consider the sale and the saloon use exceptional, and those who habitually use it to a greater or lesser extent, and who would regret to know there was danger of its being made difficult or expensive to obtain. There are also those who are sincerely opposed to the liquor traffic, but who would like to see it abolished, but who think prohibition is not the best way to reach the evils complained of. Others, while having no great faith in the efficacy of prohibition, are yet willing that the experiment should be tried.

To some extent the extremes of both sides are represented in the membership of the Legislature. While it cannot be said that all of its members are total abstainers, it is a very temperate body, taken as a whole. In fact, of late years it has been an exceptional thing that any member of either house has allowed liquor to interfere with the performance of his various duties. The position of the measure a political rather than a personal one. The demands of the particular conditions in his home district are likely to determine his action.

The friends of the referendum declare that the people wish an opportunity to vote upon the question, and that it would be democratic to deny them that privilege. The other side reply that the people of the several communities of the State already have the opportunity to determine the question of prohibition; that one of the chief objects of democratic government is to give the people a voice in the determination of the policy and the practice of the State, and in this matter.

The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy.

The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy. The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy.

The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy. The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy.

The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy. The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy.

The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy. The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy.

The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy. The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy.

The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy. The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy.

The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy. The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy.

The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy. The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy.

The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy. The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy.

The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy. The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy.

The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy. The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy.

The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy. The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy.

The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy. The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy.

The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy. The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy.

The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy. The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy.

The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy. The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy.

The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy. The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy.

As at the present time. The prohibitionists declare that the saloon is the means by which the earnings of a vast number of the laboring classes and people of moderate means squander their earnings, and that the presence of saloons in certain sections depresses property values, and that thus there is less revenue coming into the public treasury.

The other side points to the nearly \$600,000 of revenue in each year into the State treasury, besides what goes into the treasuries of counties and cities from the real estate of saloons, breweries, distilleries, etc., most of which would be lost if these properties could not be used for their present purposes.

The referendum advocates say that under prohibition crime, imbecility, insanity and pauperism would be diminished and that the saving in the criminal expenses and the cost of caring for the unfortunate would more than make up what would be lost in the way of revenue. The others again assert that the illicit use of liquor would cause as much crime, imbecility, insanity and pauperism as the open saloon, and that, even if it did not, the revenue would not be counterbalanced by any appreciable saving.

Some of the ardent friends of prohibition have threatened that if a Democratic Legislature refuses to give the people of the State as a whole the opportunity to vote upon the question, it will be taken up by the Republicans and made a party issue in such a manner as to jeopardize the continuance of democratic supremacy.

The anti-prohibitionists declare that the worst thing that could happen to the State would be to let the referendum question be decided by a vote of the majority, and that the referendum would be a waste of time and money, and that the referendum would be a waste of time and money, and that the referendum would be a waste of time and money.

The friends of the referendum declare that the people wish an opportunity to vote upon the question, and that it would be democratic to deny them that privilege. The other side reply that the people of the several communities of the State already have the opportunity to determine the question of prohibition; that one of the chief objects of democratic government is to give the people a voice in the determination of the policy and the practice of the State, and in this matter.

The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy. The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy.

The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy. The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy.

The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy. The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy.

The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy. The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy.

The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy. The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy.

The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy. The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy.

The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy. The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy.

The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy. The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy.

The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy. The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy.

The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy. The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy.

The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy. The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy.

The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy. The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy.

The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy. The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy.

The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy. The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy.

The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy. The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy.

The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy. The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy.

The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy. The friends of the measure retort that the State is a unit, and has a right to determine a uniform policy upon this question. The other side answers that prohibition is a policy which is State as a whole, and not a local or sectional policy.

a purely local application. Its motion carried, and the bill was passed.

To invite Senators. A joint resolution was reported from the House asking the concurrence of the Senate in extending to the two United States Senators from Virginia an invitation to address the General Assembly at their earliest convenience. It was adopted unanimously.

Senator Montague moved that the House bill authorizing any city, town or county of the State to use the waters of Lake Drummond for the purpose of supply of water to itself or its inhabitants, reported with amendments, be considered at once out of its order and voted on. The bill was passed.

Pass Insurance Bills.
Taking up the calendar for the day, the Senate passed on their third reading a batch of four bills dealing with insurance and related matters. These were:

To regulate policies insuring against bodily injury or disease issued in the State, and the companies issuing the same.

To provide a reserve for outstanding liability losses of accident insurance companies.

To amend the present law in relation to the bureau of insurance and insurance, guaranty, trust, indemnity and fraternal societies.

In relation to proceedings against and the liquidation of delinquent insurance corporations.

The bill to prohibit the use of the name or likeness of any deceased officer of the Confederate Navy as the name or trade mark for any intoxicating liquor or beverage, passed on its third reading, with an amendment in the title, and was reported by the committee on the floor.

Fight on Burglary Bill.
Senator Edmondson's bill amending the present burglary law so as to change the punishment from five to ten years, from five to eighteen years, and making the possession of a kit of burglar's tools prima facie evidence of the intent to commit burglary, which came up on its third reading, opened a long discussion, but was passed by a safe majority.

Senator Edmondson related a recent instance of an entire county being terrorized by a band of burglars and of the sentiment of the community that the present law was not stringent enough. He was supported by Senators Saunders, Masie, Walker, Rison and Blank. Senator Wendenburg opposed its passage, because, he said, the proposed law would, in at least one case, make the intention to commit burglary, established by a longer term than was fixed for the actual commission of the crime.

Senator Fletcher thought the present burglary law was ample, and that no amendment was needed. A message was reported from the Governor, containing a communication from the Governor of Maryland, with regard to the payment of convict labor in Washington county.

Senator Polkes introduced a joint resolution, which was unanimously carried, providing for a joint committee on the part of both houses, to range for accepting the report of the late Senator John W. Daniel, which is to be presented to the State.

Adjournment was taken at 2 o'clock.

HOUSE BILLS

The following were presented and referred under this title:

To Committee on Finance.
By Messrs. Fulton and Wiesler. A bill to amend the law relating to the support of the public free schools of the State.

By Mr. Norris. A bill to amend the general tax law.

By Mr. Houston. A bill to remove the State tax upon qualification of Confederate soldiers, making such qualification a condition to the sum allowed from the State Treasury to pay funeral expenses of such soldiers.

To Committee on Roads and Internal Navigation.
By Mr. Stephenson, of Bath. A bill to amend and re-enact section 392a of the Code of Virginia.

To Committee on Asylums and Prisons.
By Mr. Cox. A bill requiring the directors of the Virginia Penitentiary to report to the State Board of Charities and Corrections all prisoners paroled by them, and directing the Board of Charities and Corrections to visit and report upon all paroled prisoners, and authorizing said board to make regulations for the care of such prisoners.

To Committee on Counties, Cities and Towns.
By Mr. Peck. A bill to protect villages and unincorporated communities, having within defined boundaries a population of 20 or more against the running at large of horses, cattle, hogs, sheep and goats within the limits of such villages or communities, and authorizing the circuit court of the county in which the village or community is located to fix the boundaries thereof for the purpose aforesaid.

By Mr. Stephenson, of Bath. A bill to amend and re-enact section 34 of the Code of Virginia.

To Committee on